ICP - Metals Data Auditing Check Sheet

Date: Auditor:

Laboratory: Rev. 1, 3/04

Hard Copy Data Review	Yes	No	Comments
Proficiency Samples:			
1. Report or Analysis date:			
2. PE successful?			
Calibration:			
1. Standard Information (vendor and lot)			
-Analysis date:			
-Analyst:			
-Instrument ID:			
-Software type:			
-File names:			
2. Quantitation Report Review			
-Does the lab have adequate hard copy data (emission/intensity counts)?			
-Are all standards run the same day/batch? (Check Acquired Times)			
-Is the method update time the same for each?			
-Do the standards have the proper sensitivity?			
-No significant contamination?			
-Do the calibration levels support the laboratory's reporting levels (check cal. level vs. final report of sample vs. MDLs)? For DW must have a RL check standard or a standard at the RL, but calibration only requires a blank and one std.			
3. Calibration Method Information			

ICP - Metals Data Auditing Check Sheet

Date: Auditor:

Laboratory: Rev. 1, 3/04

-Quantitation method file name:			
-Calibration type (i.e. linear, RF, etc.):			
-Same for all compounds?			
-Was the calibration criteria specified in the laboratory SOP met for each compound?			
-Was the LDR/IEC study results reviewed and done at the appropriate frequency?			.
-Were data points eliminated from the calibration?			
-If yes, why?:			
-Was this done appropriately?			
Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern			
Sample Information:			
-Sample date/time(from COC):			
-Were the samples properly preserved (pH < 2, except soils)?			
Sample Preparation Procedures:			
-Extraction method: Or Turbidity < 1.0 NTU documented?			
-Extraction date/time:			
-Did the sample meet the extraction hold time?			
-Is the extraction documentation correct and complete? Acids used and temperature documentation needed			
-Was the extraction acceptable (refer to check sheets or hand notes)?			
Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern			
Sample Analysis:			

ICP - Metals Data Auditing Check Sheet

Date: Auditor:

Laboratory: Rev. 1, 3/04

-Sample ID:			
-Analysis date/time:			
-Was the sample hold time met? (6 mo.)			
-Was the proper QC run with the sample batch?			
-Was the QC at the proper concentrations?			
-Was the appropriate QC criteria met?			
If internal standard is used is it monitored for recovery?			
-Do all low level QC checks have adequate sensitivity?			
-Does the hard copy data correspond to the sequence report?			
-Are there any major breaks in the acquisition times?			
-Do all the samples/QC in the batch have the same method file/update time?			
-No significant contamination or matrix interference?			
-Do the analytical results on the Quant Report match those on the final report?			
Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern			
Laboratory Review	Yes	No	Comments
-Was the analyst(s) available for interviewing?			
-Did the analyst(s) provide adequate response to the concerns found from the hard copy data review?			
-Was the analyst(s) following proper procedure?			

ICP - Metals Data Auditing Check Sheet

Date: Auditor:

Laboratory: Rev. 1, 3/04

-If no, see notes or check sheets. -If no, is SOP correct? -If no, is the QAP correct?			
-Did the lab have the proper equipment and instrumentation?			
-Did the lab have the proper reagents?			
-Did the lab have adequate documentation such as run logs, maintenance logs, temperature logs and standard logs?			
Electronic Data Review:	Yes	No	Comments
In-Lab Review:			
1. High and low standard			
-Does the low standard have acceptable sensitivity			
-check calibration plots and correlation if not available with hard copy			
-check that the instrument is being profiled daily with analyte suggested by manufacturer (Hg, Mn, etc).			
2. Initial CCV			
-Can the laboratory reprint a Quant Report that matches the hard copy?			
-If yes, Attach.			
-If no, why?			
3. Other electronic data concerns (Identified in the hard copy review):			

ICP - Metals Data Auditing Check Sheet

Date: Auditor:

Laboratory: Rev. 1, 3/04

Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern			
Training: -If significant problems are noted above, do the analyst's training files show that they were properly trained?			